



REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application. Claims 1-84 remain pending in the application. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 11, 20, 23, 27-29, 32, 35, 39, 42-47, 49, 52-55, 61, 69, 71, 76, 77, 80, 82 and 83 have been amended. No claims have been added.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 11, 23 and 27 because of informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections have been addressed by the present claim amendments, and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 43-46 as having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "The system of claim 41." Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome by the present claim amendments, and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-84 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Klingler et al., U.S. Patent 5,404,316 ("Klingler"). Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the present claims are not anticipated by Klingler.

Klingler discloses “a conventional graphical user interface which allows the user to implement image processing techniques without utilizing a primitive special programming language.” (Klingler, col. 2, ll. 38-41). Klingler discloses that:

The image processing system of the present invention may also include suitable logic for creating data flow graphs recording the image processing operations, and associated parameters and inputs selected using the interface... (Klingler, col. 2, ll. 42-46).

Klingler also discloses “a dataflow architecture which enables the system to capture and reproduce all the operations (or steps) in the creation of a movie” (Klingler, col. 4, ll. 59-62, Figure 2).

Independent claims 1, 11, 20, 37, 42, 47 and 52 each include the limitation of presenting capture information from the time based stream of information. Applicant respectfully submits that Klingler does not teach or suggest this limitation. Instead, Klingler discloses capturing image processing operations; i.e. automatically recording “the processing operations selected to perform a particular video edit, so that variations in the editing process can be accomplished by recalling the original editing operations and reprocessing only those portions of the editing operations necessary to achieve a different desired result.” (Klingler, col. 1, ll. 34-40). Additionally, the Player View 70 disclosed by Klingler is “a viewing screen for playing or stopping an entire movie or selected clip,” and does not present capture information from the time based stream of information.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11, 20, 37, 42, 47 and 52, and claims 2-10, 12-19, 21-27, 38-41, 43-46, 48-51, and 53-56 that depend

from them, are not anticipated by Klingler. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Independent claim 28 includes the limitation to “provide capture information from the time based stream of information on a portion of a display.” As discussed above, Klingler does not teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 28 and claims 29-36 that depend from it, are not anticipated by Klingler, for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Independent claims 57, 61, 65 and 69 each include the limitation of presenting a capture output on a viewing portion of a display during the capture mode. As discussed above, Klingler does not teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 57, 61, 65 and 69 and claims 58-60, 62-64, 66-68, and 70-72 that depend from them, are not anticipated by Klingler, for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Independent claims 73, 76, 79 and 82 each include the limitation of automatically engaging a capture mode. As discussed above, Klingler does not teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 73, 76, 79 and 82 and claims 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83 and 84 that depend from them, are not anticipated by Klingler, for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.



Conclusion


Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present claims are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott Heilesen at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 6/17, 2003



J. Scott Heilesen
Reg. No. 46,765

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300